

Panel review is requested based on Applicants' position that the Examiner has failed to show that one or more of claims 1-33 are unpatentable over White (US 6,016,393) in view of various combinations of Saulpaugh et al. (US 7,016,966), and admitted prior art in making an obviousness rejection (35 U.S.C. 103).

Please refer, for example, to the Response to Final Office Action filed by Applicants on September 8, 2008, at pages 11-14, and the Response to Office Action filed by Applicants on March 27, 2008, at pages 13-15, for relevant arguments made of record by Applicants.

Applicants maintain the position that Saulpaugh, as well as the other cited references, fails to teach or suggest a mobile agent object operable to request a service listing from the host environment, determine if a particular service is within a returned service listing, and request the particular service if the particular service is determined by the mobile agent object to be within the returned service listing.

It is respectfully submitted that the "client" discussed in columns 47-48 of Saulpaugh (which the Examiner apparently regards as a mobile agent object operable to request a service listing, determine a particular service, and request a service) is merely a cellular phone, personal digital assistant, or other electronic device that in no manner qualifies as a mobile agent object as specified in the claims.

Accordingly, the Applicants' attorney respectfully submits that the cited references, taken either each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitations.